

R. Hance Haney
Executive Director - Federal Regulatory

1020 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

2024293125
202 293 0561 fax
Email hhane@qwest.com

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Qwest

Spirit of Service

February 25A, 2003

EX PARTE

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**Re: WC Docket No. 03-11 -Application by Qwest
Communications International Inc. for Authority to
Provide In-Region InterLATA Services in New
Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Monday, February 24, representatives of Qwest met with FCC staff to discuss the Frederick Poll. Keith Frederick, John Munn, Melissa Newman, Dave Teitzel and I represented Qwest; William Dever, Kim Cook and Pam Megna represented the FCC.

During the meeting, Qwest was asked why Question Number 3 in the first part of the survey was worded the way that it is. Qwest provides this written explanation in response to the Commission request. As we discussed at the meeting, Question Number 3 utilizes a standard industry technique of describing a condition or behavior to a phone respondent and then asking if that condition applies to them. The question is comprised of two sentences followed by a question. The first sentence states "[S]ome Cricket customers might decide that Cricket service does away with the need to have traditional wire line phone service in their home." That statement is followed by a concrete action stating "[A]s a result, they terminate their wire line phone services from the local phone company." Qwest then asked "Does this apply to you?" Asking respondents "Does this apply to you?" is the same as saying "some people might work in an office, does this apply to you?"

As we discussed, Qwest utilized this format for two primary reasons. First, Qwest used this format in an attempt to avoid respondent terminates by avoiding wording that could be interpreted as a sales or telemarketing call. Survey researchers are increasingly sensitive to the bombardment of phone

No. of Copies rec'd
Lit/ABODE

012

users by telemarketers and sales calls. With mobile phone users, we felt the need for caution to avoid questions that could be construed as set ups for a sales pitch. Therefore, the decision was made to write questions related to the possible ways Cricket users could substitute for wire line service in a way that would clearly communicate to respondents that the true nature of our call was in fact survey research. Obviously with a roughly 50% completion rate (**1941** completed interviews out of **3764** working numbers), the question methodology successfully minimized terminations by the respondents.

Second, Qwest used this format to avoid any concerns with leading the respondent to an affirmative answer. The use of the phrase “some Cricket customers might decide...” was intentionally used to avoid creating a possible “bandwagon effect” where the respondent felt the correct way to answer was in the affirmative. The inclusion of this language allows the respondent to feel it is acceptable to not engage in that behavior. Thus, we feel this question construct is not only the best way to ask the question but also a conservative way to ask it. To use the alternative language, such as “some Cricket customers decide ... to terminate...” would invite criticism that the survey wording was designed to create a “bandwagon effect” of “positive-response bias” where the respondent would feel awkward not admitting to doing what other Cricket customers were purported to be doing. Qwest believes that the wording used presents the proposition tested (home wire line substitution) in a clear, neutral and understandable format.

Additionally, Qwest provides a signature page for the [Corrected] Direct Testimony of Keith Frederick (“Frederick Direct”). Mr. Frederick’s Direct Testimony was originally filed in the New Mexico proceeding on April **16, 2002** with a signed signature page. On May **10, 2002**, a corrected version of the testimony was filed as the Frederick Direct and the signature page was omitted from the filing. This is the same testimony that is Exhibit DLT-Track A/PI-NM-5 attached to the January **15, 2003** Declaration of David L. Teitzel filed in this proceeding. The Frederick Direct was adopted by **Mr.** Frederick as his sworn testimony from the witness stand in the New Mexico proceeding on June **10, 2002.**’ You asked us to submit a signature page for the Frederick Direct and the attached document complies with your request.

The twenty-page limit does not apply to this submission.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hamee Haney

cc: K. Cook
W. Dever
G. Remondino
J. Myles
K. Brown
R. Harsch
H. Best
D. Booth
K. Cremer
A. Medeiros
R. Weist

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of

**Application by
Qwest Communications International, Inc.
for Authorization To Provide In-Region,
InterLATA Services in the States of
of New Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota**

WC Docket No. 03-11


AFFIDAVIT OF KEITH FREDERICK

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)
) ss.
)

I, Keith Frederick, being first duly sworn, depose and state that the [CORRECTED] DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KEITH FREDERICK, dated April 16, 2002 and filed in the above-referenced proceeding on January 15, 2003 as Exhibit DLT-TRACK A/PI-NM-5 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and, further, that these statements are true and accurate answers to the questions contained therein, and that I adopt those as my sworn testimony in this proceeding.

Date: February 24, 2003



KEITH FREDERICK

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of February, 2003



Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

4/30/2007